

SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347





ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE 9057 09/544,512 04/06/2000 Corneliu I. Lupu MSFT114614 **EXAMINER** 26389 07/01/2004 7590 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC VU, TUAN A 1420 FIFTH AVENUE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT **SUITE 2800**

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

2124

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application Applicant(s) 09/544,512 LUPU ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Tuan A Vu 2124 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Tuan A Vu. (3) Joy, Xiang (#55747). (2) Anil, Khatri. (4)_____ Date of Interview: 29 June 2004. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2. Identification of prior art discussed: Straub, Nowlin. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. f) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The issue raised evolves around the prior art (used in the last office Action) not disclosing a debugger according to what is normally perceived, i.e. setting up breakpoints and calling patching. The proposed claims put forth incorporate the limitations of claim 2 into claim 1, and along with the clarifications by the Applicant's agent about the deficiencies in the art, had it made clear to the Examiner that this debugger limitation is an inventive step not to be slighted with any processes cited from the references used. Examiner has suggested Applicant to make the amended claims even more specific because the mere fact of incorporating claim 2 into claim 1 would not as of yet make the claims convincingly distinguishable in view of possible multiple interpretations; and that not only the debugger limitation but also the operating system incompatibility limitation need to be claimed in more distinguishable and specific manner.